

**REMARKS**

1. The Office Action presented a three-way restriction requirement among Group I claims 1-10, Group II claims 11-17, and Group III claims 18-31. A telephonic provisional election was made on February 22, 2004, to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-10. Non-elected claims 11-31 are canceled without prejudice.

2. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowability of objected to dependent claims 6-10 if they are rewritten in independent form. The limitations of claim 6 have been incorporated into claim 1, and dependent claim 7 has been amended incorporating the limitations of claim 1 into it to make it an independent claim. It is submitted that the amended claims and their dependent claims are in condition for allowance. Early such indication is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 1-5 were rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Batchelder et al. The Office Action alleged that this reference taught a method for forming a three-dimensional object in a layerwise manner from a build material, the method comprising the steps of providing object layer data in a CAD system, forming layers of the three-dimensional object according to the object layer data, providing at least one substantially uniform sheet of airflow across the layers of the three-dimensional object to remove heat from the layers of the three-dimensional object. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended as described above by incorporating the limitations of objected to, but indicated as allowable, claim 6. Dependent claims 2-5 remain unchanged. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claims 32-36 are newly presented. Independent Claim 32 incorporates limitations concerning thickening the at least one uniform sheet of airflow and directing it toward the layers of the three-dimensional object. Support for these limitations is found in the original specification on page 14, at lines 3-14. It is submitted that independent claim 32 and its dependent claims 33-36, which correspond to dependent claims 2-5, are in condition for

PATENT  
USA.292

allowance and are patentably distinguishable over the art of record. Accordingly such allowance is respectfully requested.

5. In summary independent claim 1 and depending claim 7 have been amended. New claims 32-36 are presented. Non-elected claims 11-31 have been canceled without prejudice.

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is expressly authorized to call the applicant's attorney collect at Valencia, CA, if in his judgment disposition of this application could be expedited or if he considers the application ready for final disposition by other than allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
3D Systems, Inc.



Ralph D'Alessandro  
Reg. No. 28,838  
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: July 6, 2004

26081 Avenue Hall  
Valencia, CA 91355  
(661) 295-5600, ext. 2404